5/2/71

Dear Harold (ccDick),

If John Kaplan's abortion in the Times Book Review section today was the result of my prodding, as one line leads me to believe, I am profoundly sorry. Or should I appologize for another's lies and distortions?

When I saw that thing today I went into a fit! Either Kaplan did not read the book (can he read at all?) or he is a deliberate, stinking liar, both of which are probably true. From beginning to end that thing is a departure from reality, decorated with all his"liberal" and "legal" curly-cues.

I suppose that you too were riled (to say the least) by this disgrace, though such is expectable from your old friend Kaplan (who again finds it expedient to inform his readers that you are a chicken farmer--as if to say that you stayed up nights learning how to use a typewriter and, after reading a newspaper, took a crack at writing a book). But there is hope. At least you are no longer disgruntled!

Though you must already have, I enclose a copy for you and one for Dick as well.

If Kaplan reviewed any WW, I'd like to see what he had to say when I'm there. That man is a disgface to both the legal and literary professions and, I must say, to mankind. I don't have to tell you what he did in that "review."

In a strange way, the piece is so bad that if he is open-minded enough, the reader will see that it is pure bullshit. First, Kap never adresses two things which are implicit in the very title. He says nothing of the "frame-up" or of the "suppressed evidence." Perhaps careful readers will wonder why. Or [redacted] will ask why you "had to put up with" "the amount of inconvenience, bureaucratic bumbling and discrimination" you did?Or [redacted] will see that Kap's "point" re Frazier is not a point and makes no sense. Or that the fact that the books contains suppressed evidence does not jibe with the implication that you relied on only "newspaper stories." Etc.

It's just so awful and frustrating.

Best,

Howard